



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The facts presented in Dr. Meyer's research are interesting incidentally in many ways. That English quantities, both of vowels and of consonants, may vary within wide limits in the same word in different utterances, without the ear taking special note of the variation, is what we should expect, but is none the less an important fact to be established by experimental evidence. How important this may be in the distribution of quantities in reading verse can be ascertained only after long and elaborate measurements of rhythmic utterance shall have been made with the best apparatus of registration. This is a promising field of research, and one in which comparatively little trustworthy work has yet been done. It is a pity that the amount of time required for this sort of work is so great, and the expense so considerable, that comparatively few scholars can engage in it.

LOUIS BEVIER, JR.

RUTGERS COLLEGE.

George Chapman's Ilias-Übersetzung. Von Dr. Alfred Lohff.
Berlin : Mayer and Müller, 1903. Pp. iv, 113.

Dr. Lohff's monograph is the latest contribution to a subject which in its historical and literary relations has never been thoroughly investigated. His work is divided into four chapters. The first is devoted to the external history of Chapman's Homer. There, naturally, an account of Homeric translation before Chapman's time is given, and the predominance of Virgilian, rather than of Homeric, influence on the Troy legend in England is explained, preparatory to the discussion of Chapman's rendering, the first truly Greek version of the famous story to be found in English. After this survey, the historical aspects of Chapman's metres are considered. The old case of English hexameters is again tried, and, after the testimony of Arnold, Blackie, Garnett, Mayor, and other experts has been reviewed, judgment is passed against the adaptability of that poetic form to the English language. The author therefore thinks it fortunate that the Elizabethan chose for his version metres that had long held a prominent place in English poetry. In the clearly stated review of these points there is nothing new either in subject or treatment ; but in Dr. Lohff's

carefully formulated exposition of Chapman as the forerunner of Wood and Bentley in the 'Homeric question' lies new matter for reflection. This is the most important part of the chapter.

The second chapter treats of the internal history of the English version—the author's life, education, and literary career, his natural love for Homer, and his activity not only as translator, but also as commentator. In both interest and importance these two chapters surpass the third and fourth.

The third chapter traces the history of Chapman's work in English literature, quoting at length the judgments of our most noted critics, and offers, by the use of parallel passages after the style of Arnold, a detailed comparison between the version under discussion and those of Dryden (a partial translation only), Pope, and Cowper.

The concluding section, based on a careful study of Book I, and a portion of Book XVIII of the *Iliad*, discusses the poet's method of translation—his omissions of non-essential and redundant passages, his additions to beautify or expound the original, and other alterations due to ignorance, to the unconscious tendency to anachronism and misinterpretation, or to the differences between the Greek and the English as mediums of expression.

Before considering the value of these separate sections, the details of Dr. Lohff's work demand our attention. His page-references are usually correct; only on page five would we change the reference from page 276 to 236 of the essay on the genius and writings of Homer. But the blunders of spelling found in the passages cited from English authors are so numerous that carelessness alone can hardly account for them. We call attention to only a few of these errors: 'nounge,' so spelled three times (13); 'akward' (15); 'fourteensyllabled,' with no hyphen, (15); 'to' for 'too' (15); 'eights' (19); 'reverential' (24); 'token' for 'taken' (32); 'judgements' (38); 'lenght' (46); 'adequatly' (49); 'favourable,' for the abverb (49); 'genious' (49). In one quotation the word 'been' is omitted entirely (16), and in another 'till' is printed 'still' (68). Besides these orthographic errors, carelessness in punctuation often renders the thought obscure. With utter indifference to consistency, as well as correctness, titles are given arbitrarily either with or without quotation-marks. The omission of these marks is very confusing in those passages where specimen translations are quoted for comparison, as for example in the sentence:

‘Wie schlecht klingt whose dire affects [effects, presumably] the Grecian army found gegenüber Chapmans that imposed infinite sorrows on the Greeks’ (54). In yet other respects faulty punctuation often leads to ambiguity, as in the concluding sentence of the paragraph on page 31. In view of these many errors, the four slight corrections of the ‘Druckfehler-Verzeichnis’ at the end seem ludicrous; but it certainly would be unjust, Poor Richard notwithstanding, to burden the printer with full responsibility for these many errors.

Turning now to less fundamental considerations, we may criticize somewhat the arrangement of material in the four chapters. The principle of division on which that arrangement is based does not seem quite exclusive. Chapman’s premonition of the ‘Homeric question,’ for example, belongs no more to the first than to the second chapter, where his debt to Spondanus and his philological activity in general are discussed. Chapman’s choice of metres, furthermore, treated in the same section, belongs rather to the fourth chapter, where his method of translation is discussed at length. On the other hand, it would seem logical to include in that first chapter, in connection with the bibliographical facts concerning publication, what the author treats last in his monograph—the variations between the first and second editions that Chapman issued from the press. Had the first chapter been devoted wholly to a concise and consecutive presentation of such details of fact, the reader’s grasp of subsequent material would have been greatly facilitated. For the same reason, the examination of Chapman’s peculiarities of style in the last chapter might well precede the critical estimate of his work found in Chapter III, especially if in addition to mere verbal and grammatical considerations were included the question of choice of metre, and the discussion of the poet’s peculiar use of compounds, alliteration, plays on words, and other traits of style which are mentioned here and there throughout the other three chapters. From this study the reader would be prepared to advance intelligently and naturally to the estimate of the merits and demerits of the various translations, and to final judgment of Chapman’s work, which is certainly the logical conclusion of the monograph.

Criticism of the work, however, must not be wholly unfavorable. Dr. Lohff’s statement of the question concerning the hexameter,

and his estimate of the characteristic qualities of the English translations, may not have the depth and weight of Arnold's essay ; his study of the details of the translation may not go beyond what H. M. Regel (in *Engl. Stud.*, Vol. 5) has already given. But his exposition of these points is clear, and save in a tendency to exalt too highly Chapman's achievement—to call attention to the mighty beauties, as Coleridge called them, and to overlook the mighty faults—his judgment is entirely sound. Furthermore, in at least two important respects he has placed the translator before us in a new light. He has called attention, in the first place, to the significance of Chapman's assertion : 'I have good authority that the books were not set together by Homer himself,' which clearly gives him priority over both Wood and Bentley in the 'Homeric question.' This authority, Dr. Lohff then shows conclusively, was the commentary of Spondanus, supplemented and corrected by the criticism of Ælian. All students should certainly be interested to see in the Elizabethan something more than the hasty, enthusiastic poet-translator that he is usually pictured. This interpretation of the poet's work is still further elaborated when Dr. Lohff shows that Chapman in his critical notes did not follow his authorities slavishly, but to a certain extent used his own critical acumen. The views of Laurentius Valla and Hesse he opposed throughout ; Scaliger's preference for Virgil over Homer aroused his unconditional condemnation ; and even Spondanus, his main resource, was set aside frequently, especially in the thirteenth book of the Iliad, to make way for some personal opinion. The directing of attention to these new aspects of Chapman's work is, as I say, the most valuable part of the monograph, and somewhat atones for its carelessness in details, and for its looseness of structure.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY.

The Alchemist, by Ben Jonson. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by Charles M. Hathaway, Jr., Ph. D. (*Yale Studies in English* XVII. Albert S. Cook, Editor.) New York : Henry Holt and Co., 1903. Pp. 373.

Now that the competition of bibliophiles has forced up the prices of Elizabethan and Jacobean quartos and folios to a point beyond